



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,933	08/04/2003	Michael A. Bass	16223-00037	4951

33772 7590 12/04/2006

MCDONALD HOPKINS CO., LPA
2100 BANK ONE CENTER
600 SUPERIOR AVENUE, E.
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-2653

EXAMINER

BECKER, SHASHI KAMALA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/633,933	Applicant(s) BASS ET AL.	
	Examiner Shashi K. Becker	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/20/03, 12/19/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Titus et al (hereinafter Titus), US Patent 6406227.

- In regards to claims 1 and 19, Titus teaches an interactive object identification system comprising; user interface means for inputting at least one specified variable related to a first object, said specified variable being physically observed by a user of the system (column 18 lines 45-57); database means for identifying a master object through comparison of known values against the specified variable (column 18 lines 45-57); and display means for presenting information about the identified master object to the user (column 10 lines 1-10).
- In regards to claims 2 and 20, Titus teaches, wherein the display means includes selectively activated means for distinguishing the identified master object from a set of other objects (column 10 lines 1-10).

- In regards to claims 3 and 14, Titus teaches, further comprising: tracking means for recording and monitoring variables related to utilization of the system (column 13 lines 46-55).
- In regards to claim 4, Titus teaches, wherein the variables recorded and monitored by the tracking (column 13 lines 46-55), include information related to inventory levels for at least one item selected from the group consisting of: the identified master object and at least a portion, of the set of other objects (column 18 lines 45-57).
- In regards to claims 13 and 29, Titus teaches wherein the identified master object comprises a key blank (column 3 line 65-column 4 line 15).
- In regards to claims 16 and 26, Titus teaches, further comprising verification means for confirming that the identified master object physically provided to the user matches the information about the identified master object presented to the user (column 18 lines 45-57).
- In regards to claim 25, Titus teaches, further comprising a means for tracking inventory levels of the set of possible key blanks, said means for tracking operatively associated with the computer (column 18 lines 45-57).
- In regards to claim 28, Titus teaches, further comprising key replication means for creating a duplicate copy of the first object (column 4 lines 15-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2179

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 5-12, 15, 18, and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Titus in view of Covington et al (hereinafter Covington), US 2003/0154135.

- In regards to claims 5 and 7, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). Titus further teaches updating elements of the system (column 10 lines 1-10). However, Titus fails to specifically teach utilizing a computerized network.

Covington teaches an interactive in-store/in-mall and on-line shopping system and method. Covington further teaches utilizing a computerized network (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus to include a computerized network in order to have a network of computers. One would have been

motivated to make such a combination in order to communicate with many different computers.

- In regards to claims 6 and 8, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). Titus further teaches further comprising a plurality of user interface means connected to the database (column 10 lines 1-10). However, Titus fails to specifically teach utilizing a computerized network.

Covington teaches an interactive in-store/in-mall and on-line shopping system and method. Covington further teaches utilizing a computerized network (Figure 1). It would have been obvious for the same reasons stated above (see claims 5 and 7 *supra*).

- In regards to claims 9 and 15, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). Titus further teaches wherein the tracking means transmits the variables (column 13 lines 46-55).

However, Titus fails to specifically teach utilizing a computerized network.

Covington teaches an interactive in-store/in-mall and on-line shopping system and method. Covington further teaches utilizing a computerized network (Figure 1). It would have been obvious for the same reasons stated above (see claims 5 and 7 *supra*).

- In regards to claims 10, 18 and 30, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). However, Titus

fails to specifically teach further comprising user help means for providing the user with assistance in operating the system.

Covington teaches an interactive in-store/in-mall and on-line shopping system and method. Covington further teaches further comprising user help means for providing the user with assistance in operating the system (page 6 paragraph [0091]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus to include a user help means in order to provide the user with assistance in operating the system. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide the user with assistance.

- In regards to claim 11, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). Titus further teaches further comprising verification means for confirming that the identified master object physically provided to the user matches the information about the identified master object presented to the user (column 18 lines 45-57).
- In regards to claim 12, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). Titus further teaches wherein the identified master object comprises a key blank (column 3 line 65-column 4 line 15).
- In regards to claim 31, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). However, Titus fails to specifically teach, further comprising a means for recording and selectively retrieving a

historical log of information about the user or the operation of the system, said means for recording and selectively retrieving a historical log operatively associated with the computer.

Covington teaches an interactive in-store/in-mall and on-line shopping system and method. Covington further teaches comprising a means for recording and selectively retrieving a historical log of information about the user or the operation of the system, said means for recording and selectively retrieving a historical log operatively associated with the computer (page 6 paragraph [0091]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus, to include recording and retrieving a historical log of information of the user or operating system, in order to have a historical log of the user or operation system. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to keep track of previous items scanned through the system by the user.

- In regards to claim 32, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). However, Titus fails to specifically teach, wherein the computer is selected from the group consisting of: a personal computer, a personal digital assistant, a hand-held computing device and a miniaturized, embedded computer having an integrated and abbreviated alphanumeric display.

Covington teaches an interactive in-store/in-mall and on-line shopping system and method. Covington further teaches wherein the computer is selected from

the group consisting of: a personal computer, a personal digital assistant, a hand-held computing device and a miniaturized, embedded computer having an integrated and abbreviated alphanumeric display (page 12 paragraph [0143]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus to include the computer is a PDA, in order to make the device portable. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to have a more mobile apparatus.

- In regards to claim 33, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). However, Titus fails to specifically teach utilizing a computerized network.

Covington teaches an interactive in-store/in-mall and on-line shopping system and method. Covington further teaches utilizing a computerized network (Figure 1). It would have been obvious for the same reasons stated above (see claims 5 and 7 *supra*).

- In regards to claim 34, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). Titus further teaches selectively updating the database (column 10 lines 1-10). However, Titus fails to specifically teach, wherein the computerized network is selected from the group consisting of: a local area network, a wide area network and the internet.

Covington teaches an interactive in-store/in-mall and on-line shopping system and method. Covington further teaches wherein the computerized network is selected from the group consisting of: a local area network, a wide area network

and the internet (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus, to include the computerized network is a local area network, a wide area network and the internet in order to have web capabilities. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to communicate with the web and other computerized networks.

6. Claims 17 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Titus in view of Eberhardt US Patent 5382784.

Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). However, Titus fails to specifically teach, wherein the verification means includes at least one item selected from the group consisting of: a machine vision system and a radio frequency identification system.

Eberhardt teaches a hand-held dual technology identification tag reading head.

Eberhardt further teaches wherein the verification means includes at least one item selected from the group consisting of: a machine vision system and a radio frequency identification system (column 1 lines 6-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus to include a machine vision system and a radio frequency identification system, in order to identify objects. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to better identify the scanned objects.

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Titus in view of Almblad et al (hereinafter Almblad), US Patent 6065911.

Art Unit: 2179

Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). However, Titus fails to specifically teach, further comprising an automated means for restocking at least selected portions of the set of possible key blanks, said automated means for restocking operatively associated with the computer.

Almblad teaches a method and apparatus for automatically making keys. Almblad further teaches an automated means for restocking at least selected portions of the set of possible key blanks, said automated means for restocking operatively associated with the computer (column 31 lines 54-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus to include automatic restocking of key blanks in order to make a more efficient machine. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to create a human interaction free machine and make the process more effective.

8. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Titus in view of Wills et al (hereinafter Wills), US Patent 606474.

Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). However, Titus fails to specifically teach, wherein the means for distinguishing the identified master object comprises a display rack having a series of lights wherein a single light indicative of the identified master object is selectively illuminated.

Wills teaches a method and apparatus for using light to identify a key. Wills further teaches (Abstract and Figure 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus to

Art Unit: 2179

include the use of light to identify a key in order to better point out the identified key.

One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to correctly identify the specified object/key.

9. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Titus and Wills as applied to claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, and 29 above, and further in view of Lemelson, US Patent 5966457.

- In regards to claim 22, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). However, Titus fails to specifically teach the means for distinguishing the identified master object further comprises:
 - (i) at least one shift register operatively associated With the series of lights and
 - (ii) means for selectively adjusting the output signal to be compatible with the shift register.

Lemelson teaches a method for inspecting, coding and sorting objects.

Lemelson further teaches the means for distinguishing the identified master object further comprises: (i) at least one shift register operatively associated with the series of lights and (ii) means for selectively adjusting the output signal to be compatible with the shift register (column 13 lines 19-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method and apparatus of Titus and Wills to include a shift register in order to use a single light out of a series of lights to identify the object. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to better identify the master object/key with a single light out of a series of lights.

Art Unit: 2179

- In regards to claim 23, Titus teaches the above limitations (see claims 1-4, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, and 29 *supra*). Titus further teaches wherein the identified master object comprises a key blank (column 3 line 65-column 4 line 15).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shashi K. Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-8919. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SKB

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER